

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
AUGUST 3, 2007  
J. MARTIN GRIESEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
TWO CENTENNIAL PLAZA – SUITE 700  
805 CENTRAL AVENUE**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Faux called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

**Commission Members:**

***Present:*** Caleb Faux, Donald Mooney, Milton Dohoney Jr., John Schneider and James Tarbell.

**Community Development and Planning Staff:** Margaret Wuerstle, Bonnie Holman, Caroline Kellam, Steve Briggs, Katherine Keough-Jurs, Jennifer Walke, Alex Peppers and Morag Adlon.

**Law Department:**

Julia Carney

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Submission of the minutes from the July 6, 2007 and July 13, 2007 Planning Commission meetings for approval.

**Motion:** Mr. Schneider moved approval of the minutes for July 6, 2007.

**Second:** Mr. Mooney

**Ayes:** Mr. Faux, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider

**Nays:** None, **motion carried**

**Motion:** Mr. Schneider moved approval of the minutes for July 13, 2007.

**Second:** Mr. Mooney

**Ayes:** Mr. Faux, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider

**Nays:** None, **motion carried**

**CONSENT ITEMS**

**ITEM #1** A report and recommendation on an amendment to the lease agreement – Corporation for Findlay Market of Cincinnati.

**Motion:** Mr. Mooney moved approval of Consent Item #1.

**Second:** Mr. Schneider  
**Ayes:** Mr. Faux, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider  
**Nays:** None, **motion carried**

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

*Mr. Faux asked that Item #3 be heard before Item #2 because Mr. Tarbell had not arrived yet and Mr. Faux had to recuse himself from Item #2.*

**ITEM #3** A report and recommendation on a proposed zone change from RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family District to OL Office Limited District at 5050 Madison Road in Madisonville.

*Ms. Katherine Keough-Jurs, Senior Planner presented this item.*

### **GENERAL INFORMATION:**

**Petitioners:** The Children's Home of Cincinnati  
5050 Madison Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45227

**Purpose:** To construct a new administration building.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Children's Home of Cincinnati (the Children's Home) has been in existence since 1864, and has operated on the 40-acre site at 5050 Madison Road since 1917. The Children's Home, a private, non-profit social service agency and school, has evolved through the years to meet community needs. It has changed focus from traditional orphanages to a program that allows children to remain in their own homes or foster homes to receive services. In the 1970's, the Children's Home converted its facilities from a home for dependent children to a residential treatment center, and constructed Cottages to reflect a smaller, more home-like atmosphere. In 1996, the Children's Home discontinued the residential aspect of their program, and converted to a school that is a day-time facility offering additional complementary programs to children and parents. Today, the Children's Home offers services in four core areas: Adoption, Early Childhood Development, Education and Mental Health.

In implementing their campus master plan, the Children's Home plans to build an office building to house administrative staff on the northern portion of their site, with an entrance off of Duck Creek Road. The building proposed is to be a two-story 20,000 square foot structure on a 10,000 square foot footprint. Because the site consists of multiple buildings on a single parcel and is currently zoned RM-2.0, it was deemed that a zone change was necessary to build the office structure. After reviewing the needs of the Children's Home and the physical aspects of the site, Staff recommended an IR Institutional-Residential zone. This zone was initially recommended because the Children's Home site more closely resembles a campus than a residential or commercial

development. Additionally, the IR zone would allow the Children's Home to continue to implement their campus master plan by replacing buildings and expanding on their site without subdividing their property into sub-minimum sized lots. The buffer yard required in the IR zone would have offered protection to the adjacent SF-6 Single Family Residential zone from any new construction.

Based on Staff's recommendation, the Children's Home applied for a zone change to IR for the entire 40-acre site. However, during the zone change process, many property owners from surrounding residential properties became concerned about some of the recommendations in the Children's Home's campus master plan. Specifically, there was concern about plans to consolidate students from another portion of their program, the Hope Academy, currently located in Mt. Healthy, onto the Children's Home campus in Madisonville. The primary concern was that the students from Hope Academy would be older and could possibly have juvenile records. Many residents and property owners were led to believe that the proposed zone change was requested to move the Hope Academy students onto the Madison Road site. Although Staff explained that this was not the purpose of the zone change, and that the consolidation of students would be currently permitted as schools are permitted uses, in the RM-2.0 zone some residents opposed the zone change vehemently. Some residents also opposed the zone change because of the potential accessory uses and maximum height of 200 feet permitted in the IR zone.

As a result of the intense public reaction, the Children's Home revised their zone change request to address only the issue of the proposed administration building. They have subdivided a 5.5 acre parcel at the northwest corner of their site and have modified their zone change application to change the zoning from RM-2.0 to OL on that parcel alone. There is no request for a change to the remainder of the Children's Home's 40-acre site.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property is approximately 5.5 acres in size, and is located at the northwest corner of a 40-acre site located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Madison Road and Red Bank Expressway. This property is accessed from Duck Creek Road.

The property surrounding the parcel is as follows:

North: ML Manufacturing Limited and MG Manufacturing General

West: SF-6 Residential Single Family

South: RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family

East: RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family

**PLANS:**

There are currently no Plans for the Madisonville community that encompass or make reference to this property.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Planning staff held a public conference on this zone change request on July 5, 2007. Fifteen people were in attendance, including representatives from the Children's Home and the Madisonville Community Council.

The Children's Home has gone to great lengths to encourage public discourse regarding this subject. In addition to the two meetings typically part of the zone change process, representatives from the Children's Home met with the surrounding residents and property owners on several occasions. First, on June 27, 2007, Ellen Katz Johnson, President and CEO of the Children's Home, invited surrounding property owners to a meeting at which she presented their master plan and explained their request for a zone change. Planning Staff was in attendance at this meeting to explain the process of the zone change and answer questions. When the topic of the proposed consolidation of Hope Academy became controversial, the Children's Home and surrounding residents scheduled meetings on that issue alone. Ms. Johnson met with surrounding property owners on several occasions, including a gathering at a neighborhood home on July 18, 2007 to which all neighboring residents were invited via flyers distributed door-to-door. Ms. Johnson also invited all residents to visit with her personally at her office.

Administrators from the Children's Home and residents of Madisonville have used this experience as an opportunity to open the channel of communication between the two groups. Both groups have indicated that they hope to continue to build a relationship and have more regular contact in the future.

The Madisonville Community Council voted to support the request for a zone change from RM-2.0 to OL at their regularly scheduled meeting on July 19, 2007.

#### **ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:**

Upon review of this request, it is logical to consent to the change to OL to allow the Children's Home to build an administration building, especially given the change in the request to accommodate community concerns. An office building for administrative functions of a school is a logical and necessary use in a campus setting. However, a standard change of zoning must carefully consider any and all uses permitted by the zone in question. Even with this consideration in mind, the change makes sense from a strict view of land use – with properties to the north zoned for manufacturing uses and properties to the south, east and west zoned for single and multi-family residential uses, an office zone creates a buffer between the two. If the Children's Home were to sell their property to another owner, an office zone would provide a suitable buffer between potential manufacturing uses to the north and potential residential uses surrounding.

#### **CONCLUSIONS:**

1. A rezoning to the OL Office Limited district will allow the Children's Home to construct their administration building on the northern portion of their site, with access from Duck Creek Road.
2. An OL zoning designation on this site provides a buffer between the manufacturing zones to the north and the single-family and multi-family residential zones to the south, east and west.

3. The OL zoning district on only this property will provide time for administrators at the Children's Home and nearby property owners to discuss the campus master plan for the remainder of the site, and consider it's impact on the surrounding residential community.
4. The Madisonville Community Council voted to support this zone change, and the Children's Home and surrounding property owners have indicated that they plan to continue to build a relationship and have more regular contact.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning recommended that City Planning Commission take the following action:

**Approve** the zone change from RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family District to OL Office Limited District at 5050 Madison Road in Madisonville.

*Mr. Tarbell arrived at 9:12 AM.*

### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Keough-Jurs gave a brief overview of the staff report and presented a map to illustrate the proposed zone change area. She pointed out that in 1996, the Children's Home discontinued the residential aspect of their program and converted to a day-time facility. She stated that the Children's Home approached the City with a Campus Master Plan that included the construction of an administrative building on their campus. She said that since the new Zoning Code did not allow multiple buildings on one lot, staff proposed changing the zoning to an IR district. However, the neighboring residents were opposed to the new zoning for the entire property and were concerned that the Children's Home would bring in high school age children from Mt. Healthy. The Children's Home decided to focus on the administrative building since that was their immediate concern and make decisions about the rest of the Campus Master Plan at a later date. They revised their request to rezone a portion of their property to an Office Limited (OL) district.

Mr. Mooney asked if the Children's Home school was the Hope Academy. Mr. Tim Daugherty, of the Children's Home of Cincinnati, stated that it was not the David Brenneman Hope Academy.

Mr. Schneider asked about the size of the proposed administrative building and lot. Ms. Keough-Jurs stated that the building would be 2-stories and have 20,000 square feet with additional parking. The maximum height would be 45 feet and the lot would be 5 acres. Mr. Schneider asked about the topography and heights of nearby structures. Ms. Keough-Jurs explained that the site had a ravine and steep hills and thought that the nearby Coke plant was 5 stories and the school was 2 stories.

**Motion:** Mr. Mooney moved approval of Item #3.  
**Second:** Mr. Schneider

**Ayes:** Mr. Faux, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Tarbell, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider  
**Nays:** None, **motion carried**

*Mr. Faux recused himself from Item #2. Mr. Mooney chaired the meeting.*

**ITEM #2** A report and recommendation on a proposed change in zoning at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway from the existing SF-20 Single-Family to RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family in the neighborhood of East Walnut Hills.

*Mr. Steve Briggs, Senior Planner presented this item.*

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

**Property Owner:** Theodore Alan Gleason  
P O Box 3603  
Big Bear Lake, California 92315

**Agent:** Timothy M. Burke  
Manley Burke, LPA  
225 W. Court Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

**Reason for Change:** To construct a 12-Unit Condominium building

**Staff Conference**

The Department of Community Development and Planning staff held a conference on this request on Wednesday, October 4, 2006.

**Background**

The subject property is 1.8 acres in size that is zoned SF-20 and is within a hillside district overlay. The property contains four parcels.

Parcel One: 25,855 sq ft [.608 ac] [2110 Columbia Parkway]  
Parcel Two: 12,772 sq ft [.293 ac] [2106 Columbia parkway]  
Parcel Three: 19,863 sq ft [.467 ac]  
Parcel Four: 20,307 sq ft [.477 ac]

Parcel One contains an existing two-family structure sited on the lower half of the property and Parcel Two contains an existing two family structure sited on the upper half of the property. The two-family building within Parcel Two has a mural painted by Leo Murphy on its front façade and may be eligible for the National Register for its artistic significance.

Each of the existing two family buildings shares vehicular access to Columbia Parkway via a single driveway ramp. All parcels have frontage on Columbia Parkway. The two-

family structures on Parcel One and Parcel Two are existing nonconforming uses within the current SF-20 zone district.

The subject property is one of two privately owned pieces of land on the north side of Columbia Parkway with vehicular driveway access. The other property with shared access is 1850-1852 Columbia Parkway, the Cavally residence and Historic Benn Pitman House respectfully, currently zoned SF-10 Single Family.

Contour elevations along Columbia Parkway are approximately 600 feet at the driveway entrance on the west side of the Gleason property. At the rear property line of 2110 Columbia Parkway, the contour elevations range between 665 feet to 675 feet. At the rear property line of 2106 Columbia Parkway, the contour elevations are approximately 750 feet.

### **Zoning**

The SF-20 Single Family District requires 20,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit.

The RM-2.0 Multi-Family District requires 2,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit.

Applications for development permission within a Hillside District are subject to the rules and regulations of Chapter 1433 Hillside Overlay District of the Cincinnati Zoning Code.

A change in zoning at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway from SF-20 to RM 2.0 as applied to land area of the property will increase the potential overall site density from four dwelling units to 39 dwellings on 1.8 acres.

### **History of Zoning**

1. 1933-1963 property zoned Residence "C", a high-density residential zone.
2. 1963-1984 properties zoned R-V, Residence View District [R-5 density 1,500 sq. ft. per dwelling unit, potential of 52 units on 1.8 acres].
3. 1984-2004 a R-3 Two-Family Zone District was applied on the lower 1.11 acres of the property to a depth of 150 feet north of Columbia Parkway per Ordinance No. 27-1984 [R-3 density is 4,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit with a potential 12 units on lower 1.11 acres and on the upper .71 acre portion of property zoned RV, the potential density was 20 units. In 1984, the density for the property was approximately 32 dwelling units].
4. EQ-HS [Environmental Quality Hillside District] No. 9 applied per Ordinance No. 29-1984.
5. EQ-HS Case No. 617.11, 2110 Columbia Parkway application to increase dwelling units denied by Hearing Examiner via a reconsideration decision of 11/4/90. Subsequently approved pursuant to Appellate Court Decision of 6/9/93.

6. EQ-HS Case No. 617.17, 2106 Columbia Parkway approval granted to enlarge, repair and replace retaining walls to allow for a greater turning radius for better vehicular ingress and egress. Hearing Examiner Decision of 3/6/92.
7. EQ-HS Case No. 617.23, approval granted for a three story single family with attached garage, renovate an existing three story residence and construct a accessory garage with servant quarters. In addition, repair and replace existing stonewalls along driveways and provide landscaping. Hearing Examiner Decision of 10/30/92
8. EQ-HS Case No. 617.38, concerning both 2106 and 2110 Columbia Parkway, approval granted for a new two-family building on the west portion of the property and a garage addition to the existing two-family. Denied approval for a second new two-family building on the east portion of the property. Hearing Examiner Decision of 3/29/02.
9. 2004, properties zoned SF-20 and designated within a Hillside District Overlay per Ordinance No. 15-2004 as a part of the new zoning code adoption by City Council on 1/14/04. [Current SF-20 zoning requires a minimum of 20,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit for a maximum density of four dwelling units on 1.8 acres. The two existing two-family buildings are, under current zoning, existing non-conforming uses].

From 1990 to 2004, the property owner has consistently requested and received permission to add additional single-family dwellings or two-family buildings, including retaining walls and driveway entrance improvements. The retaining walls and driveway entrance improvements were constructed as approved. None of the approved new single family or two family buildings has been constructed.

Applications requesting permission to construct larger multi-family buildings with more than two dwelling units have not been previously submitted for the subject property.

#### **Adjoining Land Use and Zoning**

The adjoining property to the west is vacant without access to Columbia Parkway and is zoned SF-20 Single Family. The adjoining property to the northwest contains a 45 dwelling unit multi-family building, *The Husman House Condominiums*, 1617 East McMillan Street that is within a RM-2.0 district. To the north are single families, two-family and multi-family land use buildings within a RM-2.0 district with access to East McMillan Street. The adjoining property to the east is vacant without access to Columbia Parkway.

#### **Preliminary Geotechnical Study**

As part of the petition for the change in zoning a preliminary geotechnical study was submitted. The H.C. Nutting Company prepared the study, dated August 11, 2006. Given the fact that this property has had several hillside development reviews in its zoning history between 1990 and 2004, each review requiring preliminary geotechnical analysis,



resulting in numerous test borings and test pits, the geologic record has generally been well documented.

### **Development Proposal**

As part of the petition for the change in zoning the property owner submitted a development proposal. The property owner proposes to construct a twelve-unit condominium building with a lower level-parking garage. The garage will include 27 parking spaces. The building will have three units on each floor with each unit having an area of 2,000 square feet. The building proposed is approximately 135 feet wide and 70 feet deep. This building will take the place of the existing three-story two family building and parking area located within Parcel One, 2110 Columbia Parkway. The height of the new condominium building would be parking level plus four floors approximately 50 feet, assuming a ten-foot height per floor. The yard setbacks are proposed to include a front yard of 70 feet, east side yard of 65 feet, rear yard of one foot and a west side yard of 120 feet. Improvements are proposed for the existing egress and ingress access to accommodate the proposed twelve-unit condominium building vehicular needs. Kleingers & Associates, Inc., prepared an Access Study for the existing Driveway at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway. The proposed building would be subject to a Hillside District Overlay review prior to receiving a building permit.

The property owner proposes to preserve the other existing two-family located on the upper portion of the property within Parcel Two, 2106 Columbia Parkway that may be eligible for the National Register for its artistic significance. Access to this building will continue via an access easement shared with the proposed twelve-unit condominium building.

### **Access Study**

Kleingers & Associates, Inc., prepared an Access Study for the existing Driveway at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway. The property owner submitted the access study with the petition for the change in zoning. The Department of Transportation and Engineering [DOTE] has review the Access Study and Kleingers & Associates has responded with data and a design proposal for right in and right out modification to the entrance driveway.

In an Interdepartmental Correspondence dated December 13, 2006 DOTE stated in part, that they are not supportive of a change in zoning and subsequent site design that will increase the traffic volumes entering and existing a driveway onto Columbia Parkway, as this will negatively impact public safety. It has long been an effort of DOTE to close existing access points along Columbia Parkway, with work beginning soon on the portion from Torrence to Delta. Should the Planning Commission or City Council decide to allow the zone change, DOTE will require modifications to the driveway and Columbia Parkway with further engineering and plan review to follow prior to any permit approval through the Building Department.

## **Discussion**

The individual parcels of property located north of Columbia Parkway have been in the last 30-40 years either controlled by the City or privately owned without vehicular access to the parkway. The wall along the north side of the roadway has been effective in limiting vehicular access from properties that front onto the parkway. There are two locations, however, that allow private property owners vehicular access to the parkway: the Cavally and Benn Pitman House driveway and the Gleason Property driveway. Individually, each of the property owners with vehicular access to Columbia Parkway was able periodically, to receive development permission for the renovation of existing and the construction of new structures and buildings. Permission to proceed with private property improvement was obtained through established procedures for reviews, hearings and decisions as required by the Cincinnati Zoning Code and each property owner was able, if desired, to obtain a building permit. Recent history has shown that permission granted for new construction was for single and two-family buildings and structures. The zoning designations at the time of permission approval would have allowed a higher density permitting more dwelling units for each property with vehicular access to the parkway. The Cavally and Benn Pitman House properties prior to 2004 had a R-3 Two-Family zoning designation and the Gleason properties had R-3 Two-Family and R-V Residence View (R-5 multi-family density) zoning designation.

The pattern of land use for the properties with driveway access to Columbia Parkway has been established as single and two-family buildings. Applications for larger multi-family buildings with more than two dwelling units have not been previously submitted for these properties despite the fact that the property was previously zoned for a higher density. The common thread between the properties, Cavally and Gleason, is vehicular access to Columbia Parkway and a deliberate land use pattern of choice for single and two-family buildings.

The issue becomes a matter of development intensity. Historically the pattern of development has been single and two-family buildings with vehicular access to Columbia Parkway. The property owners have purposefully sought to obtain development permission for single and two-family buildings, which created a low-density land use pattern even though the prior zoning would have permitted a much higher dwelling unit count.

A change in zoning at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway from SF-20 to RM 2.0 as applied to land area for the property will increase the potential overall site density from four dwelling units to 39 dwellings on 1.8 acres.

The existing land use pattern of modest two-family buildings on the Gleason properties at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway does not warrant a change in zoning to multi-family that would permit a 12-unit condominium building with the potential for up to 39 residential dwelling units.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning recommended that the City Planning Commission take the following action:

Deny a change in zoning at 2106-2110 Columbia Parkway from the existing SF-20 Single-Family to RM-2.0 Residential Multi-Family in the neighborhood of East Walnut Hills for the following reasons.

1. The pattern of land use for the properties with driveway access to Columbia Parkway has been established as single and two-family buildings.
2. The Department of Transportation and Engineering are not supportive of a change in zoning and subsequent site design that will increase the traffic volumes entering and existing a driveway onto Columbia Parkway, as this will negatively impact public safety.

### **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Briggs gave a brief overview of the staff report and presented a map and photos to illustrate the site. He explained that through the 1990's, there were a series of hillside development reviews and permission was granted for a number of two-family and single-family structures on the property in addition to improvements to the access drive and retaining walls. None of the approved single-family and two-family structures were ever built but the retaining wall and access drive were constructed. Mr. Mooney asked if there was a different access point for the same houses. Mr. Briggs responded that the access point at the beginning of 1990 was smaller and not as elaborate. He stated that the current access points were appropriate for the existing structures. Mr. Schneider stated that he had read that there was no access from the North and asked if the dash on the map was a paper street. Mr. Briggs responded that the property to the North is developed with the Husmann House and multi-family, single family and two-family structures. He stated that it was a very steep grade that increases tremendously from the address 2106 up and that there was no access.

Mr. Briggs stated that the applicant prepared two traffic impact studies. One of the studies suggests improvements to the access point to increase site distances. In a recent submission, the applicant suggested that the improvement to the access point would increase the ability for ingress and egress and would allow for a safe point of access from Columbia Parkway. Mr. Mooney asked if there would be limitations on left turns. Mr. Briggs responded that he would prefer to leave the question to the Traffic Engineers. Mr. Mooney asked if a left hand turn could currently be made. Mr. Briggs responded yes. Mr. Tarbell asked if it was the City's goal to eliminate left turns. Mr. Briggs responded that at this time you could make as many turns out of that access point as you wish.

Mr. Briggs stated that historically the Gleason and neighboring Cavally/Pitman properties have had 2 family and single-family dwellings located on them. Therefore, staff feels that putting multi-family structures on these properties does not follow the land use pattern that has been historically established. Mr. Mooney asked if the zoning had been

changed in the past from multi-family. Mr. Briggs explained that prior to 2004 the property had two types of zoning. The lower portion was zoned R3 which allowed 2 family and the upper portion was zoned RB, a multi-family designation that would allow 32 dwelling units. Currently it is zoned SF-20 which would allow four single-family dwelling units. The RM 2.0, which the applicant requested, would create a density of 39 multi-family units. Mr. Schneider asked if in 2004 the applicant objected to the rezoning. Mr. Briggs responded no. Mr. Schneider asked if the applicant was notified. Mr. Briggs responded that the applicant was notified through the citywide zone change notification process. Mr. Schneider noted that the applicant lived in California.

Mr. Greg Long, of the Department of Transportation and Engineering (DOTE), stated that with the current zoning, the 4 units would allow approximately 40 trips per day in and out of that site. The primary concern was the left turns into the site and the increased density if the zoning were changed. The traffic impact studies provided by the applicant recommended that a right in and right out access for the site would be something that was palatable from a safety prospective. He stated that DOTE acknowledges that the correct technical process was used in the traffic impact studies. However, the primary point of concern was whether or not the increase in zoning would allow a safe access point to this property. DOTE is not supportive of changing the zoning to allow a higher density because it will essentially increase conflict points and the potential for accidents because of the way it needs to be traversed even with the right-in/right-out scenario. He stated that there was also some subjectivity as to whether or not drivers are obeying the 45mph speed limit or going faster than 45mph. With a properly designed right-in/right-out driveway, in order to make that movement safely going 45, a driver would have to not only decelerate but come to a complete stop because of the skew of that movement going in the East bound direction. Because of the way it is set up, the concern would be for rear end crashes on the right-in loop. Similarly, he said that without physical restrictions, motorists could make illegal left turns into the property. There is very high volume of about 27,000 vehicles a day on Columbia Parkway. The primary concern is for safe access.

Mr. Schneider-asked about the history of accidents on that site. Mr. Long stated that there had been one documented accident related specifically to that driveway in a 3-year period. Mr. Schneider asked about accident history for the neighboring driveways and Mr. Long said that he did not have that information. Ms. Martha Kelly, DOTE, responded that she did not think there was a high accident rate as a result of the two driveways. She said that DOTE did not know the volume of trips made by the residents and therefore did not have a pattern. She went on to say that DOTE did know that adding more traffic into those locations would only increase the potential for accidents. She said that even though the traffic impact research was submitted with options for the access to be designed properly, there were still some issues that had not been addressed. How would vehicles make that right turn? How many vehicles would be using it? She said that the issue was not the design of the site, but rather whether we want this kind of density on this site. DOTE does not want to see the density increase and therefore the potential for more turns and more accidents on the Columbia Parkway. We have been very consistent with this position for many years.

Mr. Mooney asked if the City had thought about the acquiring land for the purpose of safe traffic flow on Columbia Parkway. Ms. Kelly responded that they had federal money from OKI to do an access management project on Columbia Parkway. The project initially included the Gleason and Cavally properties. At that time the cost was so high that the project was scaled back to between Torrence and Delta. There was some property acquisition and the federal project was scaled down. In the future, the City hopes to go back and acquire the other two properties. However, cost could go up and it could be beyond the money that the City could obtain from the federal government.

Mr. Tim Burke, of Manley Burke, stated that he had five witnesses to speak on behalf of the Zone Change. He introduced Mr. Greg Dale of McBride Dale.

Mr. Dale gave a brief overview of his report that was provided to the Planning Commissioners and summarized three main points: (1) The SF zoning is arbitrary. (2) It is a misuse of SF zoning. (3) The RM zoning is consistent with the Zoning Code. In response to a suggestion by Mr. Burke, Mr. Dale also pointed out that the Cavally property was zoned at twice the density as the Gleason property. Mr. Mooney asked why the properties were zoned differently. Mr. Briggs explained that when staff was given the charge from City Council to evaluate the multi-family zoning citywide, in lieu of a Master Plan, staff used the existing land use patterns and lot sizes to apply zoning districts. Mr. Mooney asked if the property zoned SF 10 had more lots on it. Steve responded yes. Mr. Dale responded that it was telling that the rezoning was not done in conformance with a Master Plan and suggested that decisions were made on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Dale described areas in the City that are zoned SF 20 and stated that it had generally been used in neighborhood areas like Mt. Lookout, Hyde Park, Clifton, Northside, College Hill which are all large single-family residential areas. He went on to say that if you look at the purpose of the multi-family district, it specifically speaks in terms of being applied in areas where there is multi-family housing located near arterials characterized by mixed housing which is exactly what you have with the Gleason property. He concluded that with all due respects to the staff report, in addition to the traffic, the primary reason stated for the opposition to the zone change was the fact that historically it had been used for two-family structures. Since the owner chose not to develop the property for multi-family uses, this was somehow justification for reversing 60 or 70 years of zoning history. There must be a change in circumstance for a valid justification to downzoning from 32 units to four units. That is a dramatic and drastic downzone.

Mr. Al Gleason, property owner and professional engineer with TA Gleason Associates stated that he purchased property in 1990 with the intent to develop it into multi-family uses. He said that prior to purchasing the property, he did a due diligence, reviewed all codes and talked to City officials to ensure that it was acceptable to develop the site for multi-family development. He stated that he received no negative input from the City officials or from his independent studies. Mr. Schneider asked which City Officials he had spoken with and whether they were elected officials or administrative officials and which Departments. Mr. Gleason responded that he had spoken to various City staff. Mr.

Schneider asked if there had been correspondence. Mr. Gleason responded it was all done verbally as he recalled. He also stated that he might have gotten some letters back. He stated that he did not go into this with his eyes closed and felt the results were favorable to go ahead with the project. Mr. Mooney asked the staff if they had approved some uses during the 90's for this property. Mr. Burke responded that it took litigation to get anything approved. He stated that the property had been in court against the City on at least two separate occasions and the property owner prevailed on both of the cases. Mr. Mooney asked if any development happened. Mr. Gleason explained that after he purchased the property he remodeled one of the houses and improved the access entrance. He explained that they spent almost a \$100,000.00 on the entrance to improve the safety. The City Council approved it, then they disapproved, and then the City tried to take property through eminent domain. He won the case in Federal Court. He said that over the next several years he received approval to convert two single-family structures to multi-family. He was also approved for 12 units, however, he never constructed them because it was not economically feasible. He stated that in 2002, when the condominium market started to grow and the City seem to support condominiums, he started making plans to build a condominium development. He stated that he did not receive notice of the 2004 rezoning. He said that he had two addresses one in California and one in Cincinnati, Ohio. He said that he was shocked when a realtor friend informed him that the new zone change included his property. He stated that the traffic concerns were relevant but that he had done traffic engineering studies. The traffic studies show that the changes he is proposing to the access would support a 20-40 condominium development.

Mr. George Gleason, architect, used a map to illustrate the proposed development and described the project. He said that he felt it was the best use of the site and had the least impact in regards to hillside and storm water management.

Mr. Nathan Moore, Traffic Engineer with Klieniters, gave a brief overview of his traffic impact study and concluded that based on his research, cutting back the wall would improve the site distance and would support the proposed development.

Mr. Richard Oakes, Traffic Engineer in private practice, gave a brief overview of his traffic impact study and explained the process he used.

Mr. Burke stated that in respect of the time limitations, their presentations were condensed. He pointed out that the data presented by the traffic impact studies was done appropriately and was acknowledged by the DOTE staff. He stated that notification of the 2004 zoning rewrite process and subsequent zoning changes were done by publication, which was not an effective form of notice and was not adequate. He said that the public thought that the change was only a text amendment and not map changes. He stated that according to law the notice was not adequate for such a limited number of use changes. He also stated that he suspected that DOTE was trying to use zoning to reduce the value of land that they could not afford to purchase. Mr. Mooney stated that based on his involvement with the Zoning Rewrite Process that he was not aware of DOTE trying to engineer zone changes. He stated that the same people wanting to use eminent domain were the ones opposing the proposed development.

Mr. Eric Russo, of The Hillside Trust, stated that the maps were one-dimensional and did not show the extremely steep ridgeline. He said that the plats on the maps were just paper streets and very steep. He stated that The Hillside Trust is against having any additional buildings on the hillside due to aesthetics and views. Any development would have a difficult time adhering to the Hillside Overlay District in respect to the Hillside Design Guidelines. He suggested that the City buy out the owner to eliminate the long-standing problem. He said personally he felt that construction traffic would be a nightmare.

Mr. Schneider asked Mr. Russo if he felt the development was possible. Mr. Russo stated that he thought that with enough money spent on stabilizing the hillside, development was possible.

Mr. Thomas Lawson, East McMillan resident, stated that he was opposed to the proposed Zone Change and development. He said that the hillside was very steep and he was concerned with erosion and turn-around traffic if a right in/right out access was imposed.

Ms. Karolon Johnson, a resident of 1733 East McMillan, stated that historically Columbia Parkway has had problems with slippage. She pointed out that the applicant proposed cutting back a portion of the retaining wall and suggested that removal could result in additional problems with hillside stability. She added that she felt that traffic on Columbia Parkway from the Eastern suburbs would most likely increase.

Ms. Nancy Evans, a resident of 1620 East McMillan, stated that she was against the zone change and agreed with Ms. Johnson's comments.

Ms. Jane Miller, 1617 East McMillan resident, stated that she was concerned that if the zone change and development were allowed for the Gleason property then the Cavally property owners could possibly apply for the same rights, thereby increasing impacts.

Ms. Solveiga Rush, East McMillan resident, stated that she was concerned with the stability of the hillside. She said that the Planning Commission members should think of the future and the legacy that would be left for future generations. The cumulative impacts could be disastrous.

Mr. Bob Goering, 220 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street resident, stated that he traveled Columbia Parkway almost daily and was concerned that if the zoning was changed other property owners would seek the same zoning.

Mr. Kenny McQuane, of 2401 Engleside and President of the River Terrace Condominium Association, stated that there had been two landslides below his building almost to Columbia Parkway. He stated that he felt residents were sitting on the cusp of a crisis and that further development would endanger the hillside.

Mr. Tarbell stated that he has traveled Columbia Parkway for over 50 years. He said that his impression was that the City has tried to discourage development along that corridor due to traffic issues. He said that he thought there had been such a policy in effect since the early 1990's. He explained that he was concerned about the increased load that the proposed development would cause.

Mr. Mooney stated that after the new Zoning Code went into effect, the Planning Commission allowed residents to contest the changes free of charge for a year.

Mr. Tarbell suggested that after finding out that the City was trying to use eminent domain to acquire the site and having to take the City to court several times the owner should have been aware that the City was not pro-development in regards to his property.

Ms. Kelly explained that DOTE staff said that the traffic impact studies used the appropriate forms as guidelines. However, engineering judgment is also necessary. A vehicle would have to slow down to almost 0 mph to make a turn onto the driveway. She went on to say that DOTE staff have also talked with the applicants about the fear of vehicles turning left out of the property causing collisions. She stated that the applicants have agreed to create a right in/right out access. Unfortunately, these are almost always disobeyed. Mr. Mooney stated that it would not be feasible to put physical barriers up to prevent the left turns. Ms. Kelly agreed and stated that even if it were possible there would also be issues with maintenance. She said that there would also be a problem with vehicles making illegal U-turns and using nearby roads for turn-arounds. She also explained that removing a portion of the retaining wall would present geotechnical problems.

Mr. Schneider asked if the illegal turns would be moving violations. Ms. Kelly stated that they would be moving violations but would be hard to enforce. Mr. Schneider asked if the volume went up would the accidents also go up. Ms. Kelly stated that the accidents would go up. She also explained that the volume of traffic on the parkway goes up 2% each year.

Mr. Mooney stated that he felt anyone contemplating the purchase of a condominium would be concerned with the traffic issues.

Mr. Gleason stated that he felt that he should have received personal notice regarding the rezoning of his property. He knew that there was a city wide rezoning but he had no idea that it would impact his property.

Mr. Dohoney stated that he felt that anyone purchasing a condominium on that site would likely be familiar with the pace of the traffic on Columbia Parkway. He asked how likely it would be for vehicles to make left turns. Ms. Kelly stated that it was very likely. She stated that in her experience people unfortunately choose convenience over safety.

Mr. Tarbell stated that he supported staff recommendations. Mr. Mooney stated that he personally supported the zone change and added that he did not care to explain the



reasons. Mr. Schneider stated that he felt that the applicant did not receive notice and therefore, was supportive of the zone change.

**Motion:** Mr. Tarbell moved approval of the staff recommendations for Item #2.  
**Second:** Mr. Dohoney  
**Ayes:** Mr. Tarbell and Mr. Dohoney  
**Nays:** Mr. Mooney and Mr. Schneider, **motion failed**

Ms. Carney suggested that since the motion failed, the Planning Commissioners should make another motion.

Mr. Tarbell asked Mr. Mooney if he would elaborate on his feelings supporting the zone change. Mr. Mooney stated that the reason that he did not express his opinion was that he felt that the issue would end up in court and did not want to become a source of advocacy for one side or the other. He explained that his general sense under the circumstances was that a zone change would be appropriate. He explained that the City should determine if they wanted to acquire all of the land along Columbia Parkway to prevent traffic problems. He said that he felt that decision would be apart and separate from the zoning issue. He went on to say that he thought that if the zone change was approved, he doubted that the project could be financed and built. Mr. Tarbell responded that he had similar thoughts in regards to the likelihood of the construction of the development. He said that safety was the real issue. Mr. Mooney said that he felt that the issue was that the City should have acquired the property in the past and the zoning code was not the way to deal with the safety issue.

**Motion:** Mr. Schneider moved disapproval of the Item #2 staff report and approval of the zone change.  
**Second:** Mr. Mooney  
**Ayes:** Mr. Mooney and Mr. Schneider  
**Nays:** Mr. Tarbell and Mr. Dohoney, **motion failed**

**ITEM #4** A report and recommendation on a Final Development Plan for a development within Planned Development District #9 (PD-9), Stetson Square, in Corryville.

*Ms. Caroline Kellam, Senior Planner presented this item.*

#### **BACKGROUND**

*The Village at Stetson Square had special approval through a series of Notwithstanding Ordinances first issued in 2003 (Ord.# 448-2003) then in 2004 (Ord.#54-2004) and again in 2005 (Ord.#374-2005). Building permits were issued prior to the adoption of the current code and this project has not received PD reviews or approvals by the CPC. The notwithstanding ordinance expired in 2006 and PD-9 does not have sign regulations.*

*Since the retail spaces are just starting to become occupied there is need for sign guidelines. Even though Phase I of the project is already built, planning staff is presenting the final development plan with sign regulations and a proposed sign for Starbucks for final approval.*

### **DESCRIPTION**

The Village at Stetson Square is the creation of a new urban village in Corryville located at the Eden Avenue and Martin Luther King Boulevard intersection and adjacent to the University of Cincinnati and University Hospital. The project is mixed-use community that contains apartment-housing, condominiums, office and retail uses in a multi-block area of Corryville, consisting of 6.9 acres, which includes both Phase I (5.4 acres) and Phase II (1.5 acres) of the development. Staff is only considering final development plan approval for Phase I at this time. Once the nature of the development for Phase II is decided the final development plan will be presented for approval. The design concept was to recreate the best of Cincinnati's classic neighborhoods, like Clifton and Hyde Park with quality architecture in a pedestrian friendly environment.

Stetson Square consists of a multi-block project that has been planned and will be executed in two phases. Phase I of Stetson Square consists of a mixed use project of 205 multi-family apartment homes and 53 condominium homes of two product types; Rowhouse condominium units (32 units) and City Home units (21 units). Phase I also consists of an office building of 63,000 net leaseable square feet and 12,150 net leaseable square feet of street level retail space. All Phase I components have been constructed with the exception of the construction of Stetson Square Block G, consisting of 12 Rowhouse condominium units. Construction of Block G began in July 2007.

### **FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

A final development plan has been prepared by Humphreys & Partners Architects and submitted by Great Traditions Land and Development Company. Elements of the Final Development Plan include the following:

1. Block A - 165 apartments (203,278 sf) with a garage ( 133,862 sf), 4-story with an elevator, over two levels of parking ( 336 spaces)
2. Block E – 40 apartments (53,466 sf) with a garage (19,118 sf), 3-story with an elevator, over one level of parking (42 spaces)
3. Block F – 20 condominiums (18,594 sf), 3-story with garages, 20 private garages
4. Block G – 12 condominiums ( 20,189 sf), 3-story with garages, 12 private garages
5. Block H – 21 condominiums (23,101 sf), 4-story with elevator over 3 levels of parking, 34 parking spaces  
Office (78,932 sf)  
Retail (15,531 sf), 1<sup>st</sup> floor street level retail, 15 parking spaces on the plaza  
Garage (58,060 sf), 366 parking spaces

### **Project Sponsors and Ownership:**

Great Traditions Land and Development Company is the Stetson Square Development Manager and has coordinated the project on behalf of a consortium of owners; Bellevue

Gardens Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation, Corryville Community Development Corporation and King Highland Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation. The apartments, office and retail project components are owned by the various community development corporations as detailed below: Great Traditions, through its affiliate, Stetson Square Builders, LLC, is the builder of the condominiums at Stetson Square.

A. Blocks A & E – Apartments & Amenity Center:

Owner: Bellevue Gardens Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation

B. Block H (Office and Retail Component):

Owner: King Highland Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation

C. Blocks F, G & H Condominiums:

Owner: Stetson Square Builders, LLC and individual unit purchasers

D. Blocks D & I (Phase II of Stetson Square – Presently undeveloped)

Owner: Corryville Community Development Corporation

**Project Investment:**

The Stetson Square Project is an approximate \$90,000,000 project based upon a mixed-use of apartments, condominiums, office and retail.

The City of Cincinnati supported this project in a variety of ways. For the apartments, the City granted an additional abatement in property taxes from 15 years to 25 years. The City provided for the vacation of a portion of Stetson Avenue, which permitted the creation of green space and a park-like environment of Stetson Green. The City also provided a financial subsidy of approximately \$3,800,000 in the creation of the underground parking garage construction for Block H.

The University of Cincinnati through its endowment resources has provided loans in the approximate amount of \$18,000,000 to various community development corporations for the acquisition of land and construction of the apartments of Blocks A and E.

The Village at Stetson Square Master Association, an Ohio non-profit corporation, was formed in July 2006 for the purpose of maintaining the common areas of the project and to provide for the maintenance, repair and replacement of the common areas.

**Schedule**

Phase I of the development is essentially complete except for the construction of Block G, which is underway. No decision has been made on when Phase II will begin, although the developers will return to the Planning Commission for final development approval on Phase II when the project is prepared.

Given the fact that most of this project is built out there is a full set of construction drawings on file at the Department of Buildings and Inspections. Landscaping and lighting are shown in the photos and renderings in the final development plan packet.

This project was reviewed throughout the process by numerous city staff from various departments in regular progress meetings. Availability and capacity of utilities were dealt with through this process.

### **Signs**

The proposal is to adopt the CC-A Commercial Community Auto sign regulations to apply to all future sign proposals for PD-9. The Planning Commission will review any sign proposals that do meet these sign regulations. All future text amendments to the CC-A zoning chapter will also apply to this PD-9.

### **Proposed Starbucks Sign in retail space**

Starbucks will be occupying the first floor retail space at the corner of Martin Luther King and Highland Avenue. They are proposing to install two wall signs, one along Highland above the awning and storefront window and one wrapping around the corner above the entrance. The wall signs will feature 14" pin mounted letters with no illumination. Both wall signs will measure 18'-9 3/4" long and 1'-2" tall (21.8 sf). One additional internally illuminated, projecting sign will be installed along Martin Luther King measuring 7.07 sf and positioned 10'-10" above grade.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH EXISTING PLANS**

Although this project is not within the University Village Urban Renewal boundary it is adjacent to the boundary. The plan encourages more mixed-use infill development such as Stetson Square.

### **CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Under Section 1429-15, the City Planning Commission may approve a Final Development Plan for a development in a PD District on consideration of the following:

#### **(a) Consistency**

This Plan is consistent with the purpose of the PD District because it:

- Allows for more efficient development of property
- Allows the developer to be more creative with the use of the space, creating a mixed-use development that would not be possible with conventional zoning.
- Includes open space areas interspersed throughout the development, and features landscaping that creates an aesthetically pleasing environment.

#### **(b) Adequate Streets**

- The development has an adequate street network

#### **(c) Adequate Infrastructure**

The following statements relate to the site infrastructure:

- The developer worked with MSD to determine sufficiency of sewer credits and impact
- The developer worked with GCWW to ensure no interference with water mains, and appropriate hydrants and sprinkling.
- The developer worked with DOTE to determine roadway design.

**(h) Sufficiency of Provisions for Maintenance of Common Areas**

The Village at Stetson Square Master Association, an Ohio non-profit corporation, was formed in July 2006 for the purpose of maintaining the common areas of the project and to provide for the maintenance, repair and replacement of the common areas.

**(f) Compatibility**

The proposed uses and arrangement are compatible with surrounding land uses because:

- The site is located near commercial uses, but is also adjacent to several residential streets. The mix of uses proposed in the Stetson Square development is consistent with uses found in the area, but the low-intensity of the residential and office uses are compatible with the nearby residential neighborhood.
- The development will assist in the continued revitalization of this important commercial corridor.

**FINDINGS**

The *Stetson Square* development has been a huge success and asset to the Corryville community and has helped to spur additional revitalization efforts in the neighborhood. This project offers a good mix of uses, high quality construction and design that is compatible with the neighborhood.

Therefore, it is the opinion of staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning that the proposed *Stetson Square* development is in compliance with Section 1429-15 “Planning Commission Approval of Final Development Plan”. The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Planned Development District Regulations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning recommended that City Planning Commission take the following actions:

1. **Approve** the Final Development Plan for Planned Development (PD) District #9 Phase I Stetson Square authorizing the development to proceed.
2. **Approve** the proposed signs as submitted for Starbucks at 242 Stetson Street finding that they meet the required sign regulations of the CC-A zoning district.

*Mr. Mooney left the meeting at 10:50 a.m.*

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Kellam gave a brief overview of the staff report and presented maps and illustrations of the Final Development Plan for PD #9. She stated that the situation was unique in that

three-fourths of the project had already been built by means of notwithstanding ordinances approved by City Council. Building permits were issued prior to the adoption of the current code and this project had not received PD reviews or approvals by the Planning Commission. The notwithstanding ordinance expired in 2006 and PD-9 needed sign regulations. Ms. Kellam added that Starbucks, the original tenant requesting sign approval, had recently left the project.

Mr. Jim Sullivan, of Great Traditions Land and Development Company, stated that the Stetson Square development was a unique project that blended the public/private partnership. He gave a brief description and overview of the project and described it as a pedestrian neighborhood traditionally built in the suburbs. The Homebuilders Association of Cincinnati awarded this project with the Community of the Year Award in 2006. The development had support from the City of Cincinnati, the University of Cincinnati, 3CDC and neighborhood Community Councils. He stated that the Final Development Plan was for Phase I of the project and that the plans for Phase II have not been completed and was not part of the current proposal. Ms. Kellam confirmed that any plans for Phase II would have to come before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Faux stated that the University of Cincinnati had possibly reached their limit for redevelopment in the area.

Ms. Pat Kimball, Corryville resident, stated that she attended the meeting to learn of any plans for the area near her home on East University Avenue. Mr. Sullivan responded that currently their focus was on completing blocks D and I.

Ms. Tonda Lyons, Corryville resident, asked the definition of RMX and stated that she felt that there was not adequate parking for local residents. Ms. Wuerstle responded that an RMX district allowed 1-3 dwellings on a lot. Mr. Faux suggested that Ms. Lyons talk with the Transportation Department regarding the parking issue.

<b>Motion:</b>	Mr. Schneider moved approval of Item #4.
<b>Second:</b>	Mr. Tarbell
<b>Ayes:</b>	Mr. Faux, Mr. Tarbell, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider
<b>Nays:</b>	None, <b>motion carried</b>

**ITEM #5** A report and recommendation on the 2007 Cincinnati Parks Master Plan.

*Mr. Steve Schuckman, Parks and Recreation Director presented this item.*

**BACKGROUND:**

On March 16, 2007 a presentation was made to the Planning Commission by the staff of the Cincinnati Park Board on the first draft of their new Centennial Parks Master Plan. Their intent was to present the Plan to the Planning Commission in two stages. The first presentation was intended to be a preview to familiarize the Commission with the Plan and to seek comments and input from the Planning Commission. This second

presentation of the Plan is seeking the Planning Commission's formal approval before presenting it to City Council for adoption.

It has been almost two years since work on the master plan update began, and after extensive research, analysis and a full public participation process, the plan has been completed. On June 21, 2007 the Park Board approved the new Parks Centennial Master Plan.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Cincinnati Parks Centennial Master Plan is built on the strong foundation of the original Kessler Plan, the 1992 Parks Master Plan, and the draft plan update staff prepared in 2004-05. It is also built on public input which included public meetings, a public opinion survey, numerous stakeholder meetings, meetings with representatives of the Park Advisory Councils and with the Parks Foundation, and meetings with two citizen advisory groups - the master plan steering committee and the master plan advisory committee. Companion planning efforts were also folded into the plan including the Uptown Parks Plan and on-going initiatives such as planning for greenways, trails, hillsides and view protection, and transportation planning. Technical work included research into best practices, field trips to New York and Chicago, benchmarking against other park systems, and analysis. Work also included extensive staff interviews and focus groups, and a series of consultant team/staff park tours.

The plan itself is a comprehensive technical document which describes the planning process and objectives, touches on the history of parks and park planning in Cincinnati, and describes the findings of research, analysis and public input, all of which leads to the new vision for the park system. The plan's recommendations encompass policies, capital improvements, programs and services, operations, needs of the organization, and funding. The key recommendations of the plan have been summarized in an Executive Summary, which is enclosed with this report. Also enclosed is the Action Plan from the Master Plan document. The Action Plan lists in matrix form all the major steps required to implement the plan in priority order and indicates the timing for each step. Copies of the complete Plan will be printed after adoption by the City Council.

## **FINDINGS**

The Parks Master Plan depicts a new vision for City parks and, in fact, for how the City and region can develop around parks and greenspace. It will establish the roadmap to accomplishing this vision and carrying out recommendations. The adoption of the plan is just the beginning of what will be a 10 to 20 year period of implementation. It is built on a foundation of demonstrated need, community desires, and innovative thinking. Equally important, it comes out of a tradition of excellence and a tradition of giving and caring about parks in Cincinnati.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The staff of the Department of Community Development and Planning recommended that the City Planning Commission take the following action:

**Approve** the Cincinnati Parks Centennial Master Plan for adoption by the Cincinnati City Council and declared the Commission's intent to use The Plan as a guide for future decisions regarding Cincinnati parks, parkways and greenspace.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Wuerstle explained that in March 2007 the Park Board staff had given the Planning Commissioners a comprehensive presentation on the draft of the Parks Master Plan. They had finalized the Plan and were seeking adoption.

Mr. Schuckman, of the Cincinnati Park Board, gave a brief overview of the Cincinnati Parks Centennial Master Plan and in the interest of brevity played a short video highlighting the Plan.

Mr. Tarbell stated that he felt that the Parks Master Plan was excellent and asked about the work that the Park Board was doing on Columbia Parkway. Mr. Schuckman explained that along Columbia Parkway from 12<sup>th</sup> Street to Court Street, they were doing new landscaping, adding trees and installing a sustainable irrigation system. He estimated that the work would be completed on December 17, 2007.

Mr. Schneider said that he approved of improving the trails in Eden Park and asked if the Krohn Conservatory would remain there. Mr. Schuckman stated that the Krohn would remain in its existing space.

<b>Motion:</b>	Mr. Tarbell moved approval of the staff recommendation for Item #5.
<b>Second:</b>	Mr. Schneider
<b>Ayes:</b>	Mr. Faux, Mr. Tarbell, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider
<b>Nays:</b>	None, <b>motion carried</b>

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Faux reminded the Planning Commissioners that there would be a special City Planning Commission meeting for The Banks on Thursday, August 16, 2007 at 5:00 pm in the City Council Chambers. He suggested that staff issue a press release and said that the special time and location would provide an opportunity for the public to give testimony.

Mr. Faux asked the City Manager to comment on the hiring of a new Director of Planning. Mr. Dohoney stated that he hired Mr. Charles Graves, III and that Mr. Graves would be starting with the City on September 4, 2007. He said that he was selected out



of a pool of 30 applicants and that Jacquelyn McCray, the Planning Commissions representative, supported his selection. Mr. Dohoney gave an overview of Mr. Graves's qualifications and stated that they would be working together to create the new Planning Department. He went on to say that in reality plans for the department would not be fully implemented for 2-3 years.

Julia Carney introduced Ms. Deborah Wyler, of the Law Department and stated that Ms. Wyler would be her replacement while she was on maternity leave.

### **ADJOURN**

**Motion:** Mr. Tarbell moved to adjourn.  
**Second:** Mr. Schneider  
**Ayes:** Mr. Faux, Mr. Tarbell, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Schneider  
**Nays:** None, **motion carried**

---

Margaret A. Wuerstle, AICP  
Chief Planner

---

Caleb Faux, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_